



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/316,897

05/20/1999

ANAND RAMAKRISHNA

1890

8450

22971

7590

10/26/2006

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/316,897	Applicant(s) RAMAKRISHNA, ANAND	
	Examiner Maikhanh Nguyen	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-8, 10-25, 27-39, and 41-47.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-25, 27-39 and 41-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-25, 27-39, and 41-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 08/21/2006 to the original application filed 06/22/1999.

Claims 1-8, 10-25, 27-39, and 41-47 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 17, and 30 have been amended. Claims 9, 26, and 40 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 17, and 30 are independent claims.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

Art Unit: 2176

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 41 and 42 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 41, the phrase "The system of claim 40" should read "The system of claim 30".

As to claim 42, the phrase "The system of claim 40" should read "The system of claim 30".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-25, 27-39, and 41-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Emmelmann** in view of **Pacifici et al.**

As to claim 17:

Emmelmann teaches a computer-implemented method of providing dynamic effects to an HTML document (*see Abstract*), comprising the steps of:

- encapsulating code in an external component that may affect a behavior of one or more elements, including elements of different documents (*e.g., ISSC's encapsulate dynamic page functions including processing of user responses on the server and thus can be reused; see Abstract & ¶¶ 0025, 0094 and 0395*);
- inserting an element into a document (*e.g., components can be added to the page; see ¶¶ 0068, 0073 and 0091 / inserts the new component into the current page; ¶0214 & embed Javascript code in that page ... Javascript code is inserted; see ¶¶ 0304-0305*);
- attaching a reference in the document to associate the element with an instance of the external component, such that another instance of the element may be referenced by a different document (*e.g., putting a component tag on the page is that all that needs to be done to enable the component... by adding components to a page, the page becomes a dynamic page ... A page might display different content ... a database component displays the current database content, which may change anytime; see ¶¶ 0072-0073, 0075, 0085, 008, 0090-0091, and 0174*); and

- providing the document to a render (*e.g., the display method generates browser code, such as HTML, Javascript, XML, or whatever the browser understands, that displays the component on the browser screen ... generates a browser page by using the component classes... page is passed to the web server (24), which sends it to the client browser*) [see the discussion beginning at ¶ 0076], wherein the render is capable of instantiating the external component, associating an interface of the instance of the external component with the element, and displayed the rendered document (*e.g., the information is stored in an array (named comps) of the browser's scripting language. It contains a component description for each component instance on the page. The component instance number is used to index the array. Each component description is an object of the browser's scripting language and contains the following information: the kind of the component; the position of the component in the component page; and the attributes of the component. This is in turn is a record containing all the attributes given in the tag marking the component ... a script must be embedded in the page. The script is executed by the browser when the page is displayed and it builds up the component array data structure*) [see the discussion beginning at ¶ 0236].

Emmelmann teaches associating the element with the external component, but does not explicitly teach “*the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet.*”

Pacifici teaches the external component is maintained in a cascading style sheet *[see col.6, lines 20-22 & col.9, lines 55-col. 10, line 67 & also see fig. 6 and the associated text]*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Emmelmann because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to claim 18:

Emmelmann teaches providing the external component to the renderer (*see ¶¶ 0140; 0142; 0158; and 0161*).

As to claim 19:

Emmelmann teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component (*see ¶¶ 0123-0124 & also see fig.10 and the associated text*), and modifying a representation of the element based on the code in the external component (*see ¶¶ 0027, 0310, and 0388*).

As to claim 21:

Emmelmann teaches the changing the appearance thereof (*see ¶ 0027*).

As to claim 22:

Emmelmann teaches the changing the location thereof (*see ¶ 0027*).

As to claim 23:

Emmelmann teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and drawing information in the image based on the code in the external component (*see ¶¶ 0073 and 0250*).

As to claim 24:

Emmelmann teaches rendering a page image from the document is interleaved with drawing information in the image (*see ¶ 0250*).

As to claim 25:

Emmelmann teaches receiving an event indicative of user interaction with the image (*e.g., the user presses a link ... Clicking on the button makes the component scroll; see ¶¶ 0098 and 0102*).

As to claim 27:

Emmelmann teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a custom tag (*see ¶ 0398*).

As to claim 28:

Emmelmann teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a class identifier (*e.g., each interactive component instance gets an unique identification called bid. The bid must be unique at least within a session; see ¶ 0107*).

As to claim 29:

Emmelmann teaches the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained inline with the element in the document (*see ¶¶ 0075, 0091, and 0094*).

As to claim 1:

It is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, Emmelmann teaches:

- rendering a page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the page image including a representation of the element (*see ¶¶ 0123-0124; see also fig. 10 and the associated text*); and
- accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element rendered on the page image (*see ¶ 0023*).

It is noted that claim 1 does not require “*displaying the rendered document*.”

As to claim 2:

Emmelmann teaches receiving an event, and wherein accessing the external component is performed in response to the event (*see ¶¶ 0076, 0098, and 0102*).

As to claims 3-5:

They include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 6:

Emmelmann teaches the external component comprises an object (*e.g., component objects; see ¶ 0179*), and wherein accessing the external component includes instantiating an instance of the object (*e.g. an instance of the component page; see ¶ 0073*).

As to claim 7:

Emmelmann teaches receiving a new document having another element thereon, the new document including information associating the other element with the external component (*see ¶ 0091*), rendering a new page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the new page image including a representation of the other element (*see ¶¶ .0123-0124; see also fig. 10 and the associated text*), and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element rendered on the page image (*see ¶0023*).

As to claims 10-12:

They include the same limitations as in claims 27-29, respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 13:

Emmelmann teaches the document includes another element having a representation thereof rendered in the page image, the document includes other information associating the other element with the external component (*see ¶ 0123-0124; see also fig.10 and the associated text*), and further comprising, accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element (*see ¶ 0023*).

As to claim 14:

Emmelmann teaches the document includes information associating the element with a second external component (*see ¶ 0091*), and further comprising, accessing the second external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element (*see ¶ 0023*).

As to claim 15:

Emmelmann teaches resolving a conflict between the behavior determined by the external component and the behavior determined by the second external component (*see ¶¶ 0094, 0174, 0179-0180, and 0396-0397*).

As to claim 16:

Emmelmann teaches downloading the external component (*e.g., the components are downloaded from the server; see ¶ 0013*).

As to claim 30:

It is directed to a computer system for performing the method of claim 17, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, Emmelmann teaches modifying the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents (*e.g., editing of the component's attributes ... to insert, move, copy, or delete components; see ¶ 0027*).

As to claim 31:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 25 above, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 32:

Emmelmann teaches the renderer displays a representation of the element and modifies a behavior of the element by accessing the external component (*see ¶¶ 0027, 0310, and 0388*).

As to claims 33-35:

They include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 36:

Emmelmann teaches the renderer calls the external component a plurality of times to draw information on the page image, and the renderer draws information on the page image between at least some of calls to the external component (*see* ¶0250, 0087-0091, and 0138).

As to claim 37:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 6 above, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 38:

Emmelmann teaches the external component comprises an object (*e.g., component objects; see* ¶ 0179), and wherein the rendered communicates with the object (*see* ¶ 0243).

As to claim 39:

Emmelmann teaches the render receives a new document having another element thereon that references the external component (*e.g., create a new component object,*

but an existing one can be reused instead ... components can have a name parameter.

Fig. 35 illustrates a modified version of the display method of fig. 11; see ¶ 0180).

As to claim 41:

Emmelmann does not explicitly teach “*the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document.*”

Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is embedded in the document (*e.g., dynamic HTML ... using a Cascading Style Sheet; col.9, line 47-col.10, line 7*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Emmelmann because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to claim 42:

Emmelmann does not explicitly teach “*the cascading style sheet is linked to the document.*”

Pacifici teaches the cascading style sheet is linked to the document (*col.6, lines 1-29*).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Pacifici in the system of Emmelmann because it would have provided the capability for forcing all such environment parameters such as font sizes, font typefaces, margin widths, and any other similar parameters that may affect the appearance of the HTML document.

As to claims 43 and 44-46:

They include the same limitations as in claims 27 and 12-14, respectively, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 47:

Emmelmann teaches the renderer accesses the external component to control the format of data input by a user (*see ¶¶ 0102 and 0108; see also fig. 26*).

5. Claims 8 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmelmann in view of **Pacifici et al.** as applied to claims 1 and 17 above and further in view **Kindel**.

As to claim 8:

The combination of Emmelmann and Pacifici does not specifically teach “*the external component is a COM object and wherein accessing the external component includes calling an interface of the COM object.*”

Kindel teaches the external component is a COM object (*e.g., COM; see page 1*) and wherein accessing the external component includes calling an interface of the COM object (*e.g., see Interfaces section; page 70*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kindel's teachings with Emmelmann as modified by Pacifici because it would have provided the capability for putting the concept of a binary component in the programmer's face by focusing on binary interoperability through interfaces.

As to claim 20:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 8 above, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 08/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a. Applicant argues that *Emmelmann does not teach the page including a reference that creates an association between an element and an executing instance of the external component* [Remarks, page 11].

Art Unit: 2176

In response, Emmelmann does teach the page including a reference that creates an association between an element and an instance of the external component (*e.g., putting a component tag on the page is that all that needs to be done to enable the component... by adding components to a page, the page becomes a dynamic page ... A page might display different content ... a database component displays the current database content, which may change anytime; see ¶¶ 0072-0073, 0075, 0085, 008, 0090-0091, and 0174*). It is noted that “an executing instance” is not claimed.

- b. Applicant argues that *Emmelmann does not teach the document that is provided to a renderer (i.e., a client browser)* [Remarks, page 12].

In response, Emmelmann’s teaching “*the display method generates browser code, such as HTML, Javascript, XML, or whatever the browser understands, that displays the component on the browser screen*” [see ¶ 0076] meets the claimed “providing the document to a render”.

- c. Applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references.

In response, Examiner notes that the test for the relevance of a cited combination of references is: “whether the teachings of the prior art, taken as a whole, would have made obvious the claimed invention,” *In re Gorman*, 933

F.2d at 986, 18 USPQ2d at 1888. Subject matter is unpatentable under section 103 if it would have been obvious ... to a person having ordinary skill in the art. While there must be some teaching, reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine existing elements to produce the claimed device, it is not necessary that the cited references or prior art specifically suggest making the combination: *In re Nilssen*, 851 F.2d 1401, 1403, 7 USPQ2d 1500, 1502 (Fed. Cir. 1988)." Such suggestion or motivation to combine prior art teachings can derive solely from the existence of a teaching, which one of ordinary skill in the art would be presumed to know, and the use of that teaching to solve the same [or] similar problem which it addresses. *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1037, 202 USPQ 171, 174 (CCPA 1979). "In sum, it is off the mark for litigants to argue, as many do, that an invention cannot be held to have been obvious unless a suggestion to combine prior art teachings is found in a specific reference." *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (CAFC 1992).

- d. Applicant argues that *Pacifici* does not teach "*an external component is maintained in a cascading stylesheet* [Remarks, page 13].

In response, *Pacifici* teaches an external component is maintained in a cascading stylesheet (*col. 6, lines 20-22 & col. 9, lines 55-col. 10, line 67 & also see fig. 6 and the associated text*).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Wies et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,161,126 Issued: Dec. 12, 2000
 - Wies et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,353,850 Issued: Mar. 5, 2002
 - E. Pelegri-Llopart et al., "*JavaServer Pages Specification*," Sun Java Software, A Division of Sun Microsystems, Inc., November 30, 1999, pp. 1-158.
8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

Contact information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Maikhanh Nguyen


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER